

Mariposa Cal
Nov 24th 1890

Dear Mr Watson

Many thanks for
the determinations of my plants which
arrived a few days ago and
for which I am much indebted. I shall
have to ask you to introduce after a
fashion W. H. Robinson who made the
determinations and who I presume is
one of the new stars that have arisen
since I have been away from the
East. I am much pleased with
his work, perhaps because to a certain
extent he has very largely confirmed my
own ideas. I already felt pretty sure
that several species would at least
turn out to be new to California as far
as represented by the Cal Botany, the
sub I mean. With regard to your
"Contributions to American Botany" I find
I have 13 to 17 inclusive from 1886 to
present time. *Sedum caudatum*, & *Astragalus*
benjaminii were in some earlier publication
which I have not seen. I should be much

much obliged we receive any that I do
not possess and which you ^{can}
find in this region, where a ^{coloured} ^{collector}
is rarer than a white man in Tibet,
and about as popular, every
botanical scrap is heartily welcomed
like a feast to a hungry man.

I have a few (not many) gatherings
of the last season which I should like to
submit to you by and by when I get
time to get them out. I made quite
a long trip in the high mts last
summer but without finding much,
that was new to me, I saw very
little, outside of orders of genera of
special difficulty like *Sorex* that I could
not account for. The mountains
have been searched far more
thoroughly than the foothills. All my
new plants here come from the
foothills. One reason is that many plants
here in the foothills last so short a time that
no one but a resident is likely to see
them. I suppose the new edition of
Gray's Manual is out, but I have seen
no notice of it. Who publishes it and at

at what price.

Turning to the list of my plants I
have a few questions suggested by it
which I should like to ask you
leaves ^{Mont. C. 1. 15} *Alta* Bailey when described
Trynitzkia Mull. sp. = *Eritrichium* Mull. sp.?
In breaking up ^{Torreyana} *Eritrichium* where does the
division line run? I should suppose
Plagiobotrys would contain the *del* & *fulva*,
Canescens, *tenellum*, *Torreyi* while *Trynitzkia*
took *E. eximium* & its allies. but I cannot
understand that *E. Californicum* & its
allies should be a *Trynitzkia*.

After *Tremula*

occidentalis { when described!

Gypsosela humifusa Turp. To what order
does it belong, native or naturalized. As
found on the alluvial banks of the San
Joaquin it might be either.

Ribes subvestitum & if my *Maupera*
plant I must refer held distinct
from *R. Douglasii*.

49 *Silene Bridgesii* was my own first judge-
ment but I have satisfied myself since
that it is the same as *S. incompleta* Gray.
I have visited the Mt Bullion locality

of the latter and it is the same with my
specimen. The latter differs from *S. Brid-*
gessii in the much taller growth (often 2 ft)
and closely pinnate-lanceolate inflorescence, much
broader + prostrate leaves &c

Tiedemannia Fendleri Curt + Peter. Where
described?

Delphinium Parryi Gray Where described?

Lepturus incurvatus " "

I hope I have not prepared too much
in your good nature but I like to give
a name by the description if possible.

I shall remember your suggestion
about the fruit of the complex at
Lathrop, whenever at the proper season,
which must be as late as Sept 15th

Is Dr. Trelease still at the Shaw
Institution in St. Louis?

When the new plants are published
I shall be glad to see the account of them

Very truly yours
J. W. Engelm